R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 657 AL 001 006

SOME SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF VERBAL BEHAVIOR. WORKING PAPER NUMBER 4.

BY- BLOM, JAN-PETTER GUMPERZ, JOHN J.
CALIFORNIA UNIV., BERKELEY, LANG.-BEHAV. RES. LAB.

PUB DATE 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.72 41P.

DESCRIPTORS- *LANGUAGE RESEARCH, *BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, *VERBAL COMMUNICATION, *SOCIOLINGUISTICS, CULTURAL FACTORS, ANTHROPOLOGY, HEMNESBERGET NORWAY,

IN RECENT DISCUSSIONS OF THE PROBLEM OF LANGUAGE AND SOCIETY, BERNSTEIN (1961, 1964) EXPLORES THE HYPOTHESIS THAT SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS ACT AS INTERVENING VARIABLES BETWEEN LINGUISTIC STRUCTURES AND THEIR REALIZATION IN SPEECH. HIS FORMULATION SUGGESTS THAT THE ANTHROPOLOGISTS' ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL CONSTRAINTS GOVERNING INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS MAY BE UTILIZED IN THE INTERPRETATION OF VERBAL PERFORMANCES. THIS PAPER ATTEMPTS TO CLARIFY THE SOCIAL AND LINGUISTIC FACTORS INVOLVED IN THE COMMUNICATION PROCESS AND TO TEST BERNSTEIN'S HYPOTHESIS BY SHOWING THAT SPEAKER'S SELECTION AMONG SEMANTICALLY, GRAMMATICALLY, AND PHONOLOGICALLY PERMISSIBLE ALTERNATES OCCURRING IN CONVERSATION SEQUENCES RECORDED IN NATURAL GROUPS IS BOTH PATTERNED AND PREDICTABLE ON THE BASIS OF CERTAIN FEATURES OF THE LOCAL SOCIAL SYSTEM. IN OTHER WORDS, GIVEN A PARTICULAR AGGREGATE OF PEOPLE ENGAGED IN REGULAR FACE TO FACE INTERACTION, AND GIVEN SOME KNOWLEDGE OF THE SPEAKERS' LINGUISTIC REPERTOIRE (GUMPERZ 1964), THE AUTHORS RELATE THE STRUCTURE OF THAT REPERTOIRE TO THE VERBAL BEHAVIOR OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY IN PARTICULAR SITUATIONS. (DATA ON VERBAL INTERACTION DERIVES FROM APPROXIMATELY TWO MONTHS' FIELDWORK IN HEMNESBERGET, A SMALL COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL TOWN OF ABOUT 1300 INHABITANTS IN THE CENTER OF THE RANA FJORD, CLOSE TO THE ARCTIC CIRCLE IN NORTHERN NORWAY.) THIS PAPER IS TO BE PUBLISHED IN "DIRECTIONS IN SOCIOLINGUISTICS," (JOHN J. GUMPERZ AND DELL HYMES, EDITORS) BY HOLT, RINEHART, AND WINSTON IN 1968. (AUTHOR/AMM)

ED019657

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Some Social Determinants of Verbal Behavior

Revised draft to be published in

John J. Gumperz & Dell Hymes Eds.

Directions in Sociolinguistics

Holt Rinehart & Winston

1968, in preparation

Jan-Petter Blom & John J. Gumperz

University of Bergen, Norway

University of California, Berkeley

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS [redacted] MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY PAUL KAY

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE [redacted] OWNER."

Working Paper Number 4,

Laboratory for Language-Behavior Research

University of California, Berkeley

AL 001 006

SOME SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF VERBAL BEHAVIOR.

by

Jan-Petter Blom, University of Bergen, Norway

and

John J. Gumperz, University of California, Berkeley

In recent discussions of the problem of language and society, Bernstein (1961, 1964) explores the hypothesis that social relationships act as intervening variables between linguistic structures and their realization in speech. His formulation suggests that the anthropologists' analysis of social constraints governing interpersonal relationships may be utilized in the interpretation of verbal performances. This paper attempts to clarify the social and linguistic factors involved in the communication process and to test Bernstein's hypothesis by showing that speaker's selection among semantically, grammatically, and phonologically permissible alternates occuring in conversation sequences recorded in natural groups is both patterned and predictable on the basis of certain features of the local social system. In other words, given a particular aggregate of people engaged in regular face to face interaction, and given some knowledge of the speakers' linguistic repertoire (Gumperz 1964), we wish to relate the structure of that repertoire to the verbal behavior of members of the community in particular situations.

Data on verbal interaction derives from approximately two months' fieldwork in Hemnesberget, a small commercial and industrial town of about 1300 inhabitants in the center of the Rana Fjord, close to the Arctic circle in Northern Norway. The settlement owes its existence to the growth of local trade and industry following the abolition of government-sanctioned trade

monopolies covering most of Northern Norway in 1858. Since the Middle Ages, these monopolies had kept the area's economy dependent upon a small elite of merchant and landholding families with connections to southern Norway, separated by great differences in wealth, culture and education from the tenant farmers, fishermen, estate laborers and servants who formed the bulk of the populace. Apart from a few shop owners and government officials, present-day Hemnesberget residents are mostly descendants of these latter groups. They have been attracted to the town from the surroundings by new economic opportunities there, while a hundred years of relatively free economic development have splintered the old ruling circles. Many of this former elite have moved away, and the remainder no longer form a visible social group in the region.

Present inhabitants of Hemnesberget earn their livelihood mainly as craftsmen in family workshops or in the somewhat larger boat-building and lumber-processing plants, all of which are locally owned. The area serves as a major source of wood products and fishing equipment for the northernmost part of Norway. A significant group of merchant middlemen deal in locally produced boats and other products, which they ship north for resale, and maintain sales agencies for motors and other appliances and manufactured goods from the South.

While at the beginning of the century, Hemnesberget was the most important communications and commercial center in the area, it has been eclipsed in recent years by government sponsored economic development which has turned the town of Mo, at the mouth of the Rana Fjord, into Norway's major iron and steel producing center. The region of Mo has grown from about 1,000 inhabitants in 1920 to almost 9,000 in 1960, largely through immigration from the region of Trøndelag and southern Norway.

It now boasts several modern department stores, hotels, restaurants and cinemas. The railroad from Trondheim in the south through Mo and on north to Bodø was completed shortly after the Second World War and the road system is steadily improving. All these new communication arteries, however, now bypass Hemnesberget, which has all but lost its importance as a communication link for both land and sea traffic.

Although the immediate ecological environment has changed greatly, Hemnesberget remains an island of tradition in a sea of change. There is a regular once-a-day boat service to Mo, buses leave for the railroad station twice a day, and a few people commute to Mo by private automobile or motorcycle. However, the bulk of the residents spend most of their working and leisure time in and around Hemnesberget. Those who can afford it build vacation cabins in the unsettled areas across the fjord a few miles away. Our interviews uniformly show that social events in Moi Rana are only of marginal interest to local inhabitants.

The Community Linguistic Repertoire

Most residents of Hemnesberget are native speakers of Ranamål (R), one of a series of dialects which segment Northern Norway into linguistic regions roughly corresponding to other cultural and ecological divisions (Christiansen 1962). As elsewhere in Norway, where local independence and distinctness of folk culture are highly valued, the dialect enjoys great prestige. A person's native speech is regarded as an integral part of his family background, a sign of his local identity. By identifying himself as a dialect speaker both at home and abroad, a member symbolizes pride in his community and in the distinctness of its contribution to society at large.

Formal education, however, is always carried on in the standard, the language of official transactions, of religion and of the mass media. Norwegian law sanctions two standard languages: Bokmål (formally called Riksmål) and Nynorsk (formerly Landsmål), of which only Bokmål (B) is current in northern Norway.

Education is universal and, allowing for certain individual differences in fluency, all speakers of Ranamål also control the standard. Both Bokmål and Ranamål therefore form part of what we may call the community linguistic repertoire (Gumperz 1964), the totality of linguistic resources which speakers may employ in significant social interaction. In their everyday interaction, they alternate between the two as the situation demands. Members view this alternation as a shift between two distinct entities, which are never mixed. A person speaks either one or the other.

The fact the two varieties are perceived as distinct, however, does not necessarily mean that their separateness is marked by significant linguistic differences. Pairs such as Hindi and Urdu, Serbian and Croation, Thai and Laotian, and many others which are regarded as separate languages by their speakers are known to be grammatically almost identical. The native's view of language distinctions must thus be validated by empirical linguistic investigation.

We began our analysis by employing standard linguistic elicitation procedures. A series of informants selected for their fluency in the dialect were interviewed in our office and were asked to produce single words, sentences and short texts, first in the dialect and then in the standard for taping or phonetic recording by the linguist. These elicitation sessions yielded a series of dialect features which are essentially

identical to those described by Norwegian dialectologists (Christiansen 1962).

The vowel system distinguishes three tongue heights. High: front unrounded i, front rounded y, central rounded u, back rounded o. Mid: front unrounded e, front rounded ö, back rounded å. Low: front unrounded æ, front rounded ø, back a.

Consonants occur either singly or as geminates. Vowels are phonetically short before geminates, consonant clusters and palatalized consonants. Vowels are long elsewhere. There are two series of consonants: unmarked and palatalized. Unmarked consonants include: stops p, b, t, d, k, g; spirants f, v, s, š, j, ç; nasals m, n, ŋ; trill r, lateral l, and retroflex flap ɻ. The palatal series contains tj, dj, nj, lj. On the phonetic level, a set of cacuminal or retroflex allophones occur for the sequences rs [š], rd [ɖ], rt [ʈ] and rn [ɳ].

The local pronunciation of the standard differs from the 'pure' dialect as follows: Bokmål does not have the phonemic distinction between the palatalized and non-palatalized series of consonants. Only non-palatalized consonants occur. In addition, it does not distinguish between mid front rounded / ö / and low front rounded / ø /; only the former occurs. On the purely phonetic level, dialect allophones of the phonemes / æ / and / a / are considerably lower and more retracted than their standard equivalents. The dialect furthermore has a dark allophone [ɫ] of / l / where the standard has clear [l]. The cacuminal or retroflex allophones of / s /, / d /, / t / and / n /, and the flap / ɻ /, however, which are commonly regarded as dialect features, are used in both varieties, although they tend to disappear in highly formal Bokmål.

Morphological peculiarities of the dialect include the

masculine plural indefinite suffix -æ and the definite suffix -an, e.g., (R) hæstæ (horses), hæstan (the horses), contrasting with (B) hester and hestene. In verb inflection the dialect lacks the infinitive suffix -e and the present suffix -er of regular verbs. Further differences in past tense and past participle markers and in the assignment of individual words to strong or weak inflectional classes serve to set off almost every dialect verb from its standard Norwegian equivalent. Here are some examples of common regular and irregular verbs and their standard equivalents:

Infinitive		Present		Past		Past Participle		
(R)	(B)	(R)	(B)	(R)	(B)	(R)	(B)	
finj	finne	finj	finner	fanj	fant	fonje	funnet	(find)
vara or va	være	e	ær	va	var	vøre	vært	(be)
få	få	får	får	fekk	fikk	fått	fått	(get)
stanj	stå	står	står	sto	sto	stie	stått	(stand)
jær	jøre	jær	jør	joɻ	jøre	jort	jort	(do)
læs	lese	læs	leser	læst	leste	læst	lest	(read)
ta	ta	tek	tar	tok	tokk	tatt or tiçe	tatt	(take)

Other important dialect features appear in pronouns, common adverbs of time, place and manner, conjunctions and other grammatically significant function words. Here is a list of some of the most common distinctive forms of personal pronouns and possessive pronouns:

(B)	(R)	
jæjj	eg	(I)
mæjj	meg	(me)
dæjj	deg	(you)
hann	hanj	(he)
hunn	ho	(she)
hanns	hanjs	(his)
hennes	hinjers	(hers)
dere	dåk	(you)[plural]
di	dæmm*	(they)
deres	dæmmers*	(theirs)

*Sometimes also di and deres

Interrogatives, relatives, and indefinites:

(B)	(R)	
såmm	så	(who, which [relative])
va	ke	(what [interrogative])
vemm	kem	(who)
noe	nåkka	(something)
vorfårr	kefør	(what for)
vilkett	kofør nokka	(which [thing])
vilkenn	kefør nånn	(which [person])
vær	kvar	(every)
en	ein	(one)

Adverbs and conjunctions:

(B)	(R)	
till	tell	(to, towards)
menn	mann	(but)
her	her	(here)
fra	ifra	(from)
mellamm	imelja	(in between)
vordann	kelesn	(how)
viss	vess	(if)

The above data constitute empirical evidence to support the view of the dialect as a distinct linguistic entity. By comparing information collected in this manner with local speech forms elsewhere in Northern Norway, dialectologists interested in historical reconstruction identify Ranamal as one of a series of Northern Norwegian dialects set off from others by the fact that it shows influences of Eastern Norwegian forms of speech (Christiansen 1962). In this paper, however, we are concerned with social interaction and not with history, and this leads us to raise somewhat different problems.

The elicitation sessions which provide the source data for dialect grammars are conducted in the linguist's, and not in the informant's, frame of reference. Although by asking speakers to speak in the dialect, the linguist may be interested in purely descriptive or historical information, the native speaker, mindful of the association between dialect, local culture and local identity, is of course anxious to present his locality in the best possible light. Consistency of performance

in linguistic interview sessions might well be the result of the interviewer's presence; it need not reflect everyday interaction. Furthermore, when comparisons with other forms of speech are made, it is the linguist's analysis which servers as the basis for these comparisons, not the speaker's performance.

In order to understand how natives may perceive the dialect standard language differences some further discussion is necessary of the way in which distinctions between what are ordinarily treated as separate linguistic systems may be manifested in everyday speech. Thus if we compare a bilingual's pronunciation of the Norwegian sentence vill du ha egg og beiken till frokast? with the same speaker's pronunciation of the English equivalent "Will you have bacon and eggs for breakfast?" the two utterances will show phonetic distinctions in every segment. The Norwegian voiced spirant [v] has much less spirantal noise than its English equivalent, the [i] is tense as compared to the lax English [i], the Norwegian [l] may be clear or dark but it is phonetically different from English [l]. The Norwegian central rounded [u] in du has no direct English equivalent. In egg the Norwegian has a tense [e] and the [g] has an aspirate release whereas in English the vowel is lax and [g] has a voiced release. Similarly, the Norwegian has a stressed vowel in beiken [æ i] whereas the English has [ey]. Bilinguals whose entire articulation shifts in this way can be said to have two distinct articulation ranges in addition to two sets of grammatical rules.

Analysis of recordings of Hemnesberget speakers' switching from the dialect to the standard reveals a different situation. In a sentence pair like hanj bor på nilsen's paŋšonat and its Bokmal equivalent hann bor pa nilsen's paŋšonat. "He lives in Nilsen's pensionat," only the realizations of /a/, /l/, and /nj/ which appear in our list of dialect characteristics

differ. In other relevant respects the two utterances are identical. Furthermore, even in the case of these dialect characteristics, speakers do not alternate between two clearly distinguishable articulation points; rather, the shift takes the form of a displacement along a scale in which palatalized consonants show at least three degrees of palatalization, ' (strong [n$_j$], weak [n^j], and zero [n]) and / a / and / æ / each show three degrees of retraction and lowering.

While the switch from Norwegian to English implies a shift between two distinct structural wholes, the Bokmål-Ranamål alternation, in phonology at least, seems more similar to conditions described by Labov (1966) for New York speech. A speaker's standard and dialect performance can be accounted for by a single phonetic system. The bulk of the constituent phones within this system are marked by relatively stable, easily identifiable points of articulation. The palatalized consonants and the vowels listed above differ in that they vary within a much greater articulation range. They are instances of what Labov has called variables (1964). It is the position of such variables along the scale of possible articulations which, when evaluated along with morphological information, signals dialect vs. standard speech.

Not all items identified in our elicitation sessions as Ranamål features function as variables, however. The contrast between / ø / and / ö / was never produced spontaneously. In normal discourse only [ö] occurs. Furthermore, as we stated above, the flap allophone / ɭ / and the retroflex stop allophones which find a prominent place in dialect grammars are also used in local Bokmål as well as in eastern varieties of Standard Norwegian; thus their status as dialect markers is doubtful.

Our texts also reveal some individual differences in the pronunciation of the palatalized consonant and vowel variables. While the normal dialect speech of most residents shows strong palatalization of these consonants and extreme vowel retraction, some of the more highly educated younger residents normally have medium palatalization and medium vowel retraction. Regardless of these differences in the point of origin of variables, however, the direction of variation is the same for all individuals.

In the realm of morphology-syntax it is also possible to set up a single set of grammatical categories to account for what on the surface seem like striking differences between the two varieties. All nouns, for example, appear in an indefinite form consisting of the noun stem and in an indefinite form made up of stem plus suffixed article, both of which are inflected for singular and plural. There are three subcategories of noun gender: masculine, feminine, and neuter, and the case categories are shared. Verbs appear in imperative, infinitive, present, and past participle forms. Basic function word categories, including pronouns, conjunctions, and adverbs, are shared, etc.

Ranamål shows a few peculiarities in the order of pronouns and verbs in sentences such as (R) ke du e ifrå, (B) vor ær du fra, "Where are you from?" But even without detailed analysis it is obvious that these differences correspond to relatively low order syntactic rules. The majority of the distinctions between the dialect and the standard thus do not affect the basic grammar, but only what we may call the morphophonemic realization of shared categories.

Even at the morphophonemic level, variation is not without pattern. Examination of such alternates as (B) till, (R) tell,

"to"; (B) fikk, (R) fekk, "received"; (B) hest, (R) hest, "horse"; (B) menn, (R) mænn, "but", suggests a general process of lowering of front vowels in the dialect. This lowering process is also found elsewhere in Norway, although it may occur in different linguistic forms. Similarly, other sets of alternates such as icce/ikke, "not"; dæmm/di, "they"; ifrå/fra, "from", are common in other Norwegian regions.

Leaving aside historical considerations, it is almost as if dialect variation within Norway were generated by selection of different forms from a common reservoir of alternates. Ranamål differs from other dialects not so much because it contains entirely different features, but because of the way in which it combines features already found elsewhere. Furthermore, Hemnesberget pairs such as (B) lærer, (R) lerar, and (B) hær, (R) her, which conflict with the lowering process mentioned above, suggest that here as elsewhere selection may at times be motivated by a need for maintaining distinctions (Ramanujan 1967). No matter what the actual historical facts are, however, the narrow range of variation we find lends support to our view of dialect features as variables within a single grammatical system.

The effect of structural similarities on speakers' perception of speech differences is somewhat counterbalanced by the fact that choice among these variables is always constrained by sociolinguistic co-occurrence rules such that if, for instance, a person selects a standard morphological variant in one part of an utterance, this first choice also implies selection of pronunciation variables tending towards the standard end of the scale. A speaker wishing to ask for another's place of residence may, for example, start his sentence either with (R) ke "where," or (B) vor. In the first case, the rest of the sentence will read

hanj e ifrå, "is he from?" In the second case, it will be ær hann fra; vor and hanj do not co-occur. Similarly, selection of e, "is" requires dialect pronunciation; the form er, "is" would sound odd if it appeared in the same sentence with hanj.

It is the nature of these co-occurrence rules and the manner in which they cut across the usual boundaries of phonology and morphology to select among phonetic and allomorphic and lexical variables, which lends the Ranamål-Bokmål variation its peculiar stamp, and sets it off, for example, from the phonologically similar situation in New York. Sociolinguistic co-occurrence rules also account to some extent for the speaker's view of the two varieties as separate entities.

Since the dialect and the standard are structurally almost completely isomorphic, and since most speakers control the entire range of variables, it would be unreasonable to assume, as is frequently done wherever two distinct dialects are spoken, that selection patterns affecting the above-mentioned co-occurrence rules are motivated by considerations of intelligibility. The most reasonable assumption is that the linguistic separateness between the dialect and the standard is maintained by social factors.

Some idea of how this came about can be obtained by considering the conditions under which the two varieties are learned. The dialect is acquired in most homes and in the sphere of domestic and friendship relations. As a result, it has taken over the flavor of these locally-based relationships. On the other hand, dialect speakers learn the standard in school and in church, at a time when they are also introduced to national Norwegian values. It has therefore become associated with such Pan-Norwegian activity systems.

Since the adult population has equal access to both sets of variants, however, the developmental argument does not

provide sufficient explanation for the maintenance of distinctness. Immigrants to urban centers around the world, for example, frequently give up their languages after a generation if social conditions are favorable to language shift. The hypothesis suggests itself, therefore, that given the initial acquisition patterns, the dialect and the standard remain separate because of the cultural identities they communicate and the social values implied therein. It is this aspect of the problem that we intend to explore in the remaining portions of the paper. Before we proceed, however, something more needs to be said about the process of social symbolization.

Students of communication usually distinguish between semantics proper, or reference, and pragmatics (Ervin-Tripp 1964). Reference indicates codification of objects' actions and experience in terms of their objective properties; pragmatics deals with the effect of symbols of various kinds on speakers and listeners, i.e., with the significance of what is communicated for the actors involved. Although discussions of pragmatics ordinarily do not distinguish individual motivation and interpersonal significance of communicative symbols, it is important for our discussions that we confine ourselves to the latter. We will use the term social significance or/social meaning to refer to the particular social value implied in an utterance.

In general, the assignment of value to particular objects or acts is as arbitrary as the referential naming of objects. Just as a particular term may refer to a round object in one group and a square object in another, so also the value of actions or utterances may vary. Thus the same term may indicate mere local distinctions in one community and symbolize social stratification elsewhere. Social meanings differ from referential meanings in the way in which they are coded. Whereas

reference is coded largely through words, social meaning can attach not only to acoustic signs but also to settings, to items of background knowledge, as well as to particular word sequences. In Hemnes, for example, values attached to a person's family background or to his reputation as a fisherman are important in understanding what he says and influence the selection of responses to his actions.

It must also be pointed out that referential meanings are at least to some extent recoverable through the study of individual words, while social meanings are not. A sentence like ke du e ifrå, "Where are you from?" can be divided into units of reference like ke, "where"; du, "you"; e, "are"; ifrå, "from". Social significance attaches to the utterance as a whole; it is not segmentable into smaller component stretches. Sociolinguistic co-occurence patterns along with intonation contours enable the speaker to group language into larger pragmatic wholes and to interpret them in relation to signs transmitted by other communicative media.

Local Organization and Values.

Social life in Hemnesberget shows a fluidity of class structure quite similar to that described for Southern Norway by Barnes (1954). Extremes of poverty and wealth are absent. Expressions of solidarity such as "We all know each other here in Hemnes," and "We are all friends here" recur in our interviews. The majority of those who claim local descent show a strong sense of local identification. To be a hæmnesværing, "Hemnes resident," in their view is like belonging to a team characterized by commonalty of descent. Members of this reference group act like kin, friends and neighbors cooperating in the pursuit of community ideals. In everyday behavior they

symbolize this quality of their ties through greetings, exchanges of personal information and through general informality of posture towards fellow members. The dialect is an important marker of their common culture. Residents of neighboring settlements, of Mo i Rana, as well as other Norwegians, stand apart from this local community. They are potential competitors who must at least initially be treated with reserve. Their dialects are said to be different although to the investigator such differences may be almost undetectable.

Despite the intense sense of local identification, perceptions of closeness within this local group are not everywhere the same among Hemnes residents. More detailed interviews, observations of visiting and recreational patterns and of the exchange of assistance suggests a clear distinction between personal relations and the more general local relations. The actual range of effective personal relations for any single individual tends to be fairly small and stable over time. For most people it includes only certain near kin, in-laws, neighbors or fellow workers. The community can thus be described as segmented into small nuclei of personal interaction. But since these groups are not marked linguistically, the behavioral signs of friendliness and equality constitute a communicative idiom which applies to both these nuclei and to other relations of shared local identification.

The meaning attached to local descent and dialect use--to being part of the "local team"--is clearly seen when we consider those members of the commmunity who dissociate themselves from this "team." Traditionally in Northern Norway the local community of equals was separated from the landowning commercial and administrative elite by a wide gulf of social and judicial inequality. Since the latter were the introducers and

users of standard Norwegian, the standard was--and to some extent still is--associated with this inequality of status. Many of the functions of the former elite have now been incorporated into the local social system. Individuals who fill these functions, however, continue to be largely of non-local descent. Although they may pay lip service to locally accepted rules of etiquette and use the dialect on occasion, their experience elsewhere in Norway, where differences in education, influence and prestige are much more pronounced, leads them to associate the dialect with lack of education and sophistication. Therefore they show a clear preference for the standard.

Such attitudes are unacceptable to locals who view lack of respect for and refusal to speak the dialect as an expression of social distance and of contempt for the "local team" and its community spirit. It is not surprising therefore that their loyalty to the dialect is thereby reaffirmed. For a local resident to speak the standard with other local residents is in their view to <u>šnakk fint</u> or to <u>šnakk jålat</u>, "to put on airs."

Since the different social meanings which attach to the dialect are regular and persistent, they must in some way be reinforced by the pattern of social ties. This relationship can best be described if we consider the socio-ecological system which sustains the community. There is a correlation between a person's regional background, his reference group, and the niche he occupies in this system (Barth 1964). This information enables us to segment the local population into three distinct categories: 1) artisans, 2) wholesale-retail merchants and plant managers, and 3) service personnel. Members of the first two categories are the basic producers of wealth.

The more than fifty percent of the population which falls into the first category includes craftsmen who may or may not

own their own shops, as well as workmen employed in the larger plants and their dependents. Most of them are locally born or have been drawn to Hemnes from the surrounding farms by the demand for their skills. Since they live and work among their relatives and among others of the same social background, they tend to choose their friends and spouses from within their own reference group and thus become strong supporters of local values.

Wholesale-retail merchants buy lumber products and finished boats from producers in the Rana area, furnishing them with supplies and gear and appliances in exchange. They sell boats, lumber products and fishing supplies to customers all the way up to the northernmost tip of Norway. Relationships between merchants and their customers most commonly take the form of long-term credit arrangements based on personal trust in which credit is given to artisans against their future production. Also part of the second category are the managers of large local enterprises who achieve their position partly because of their special commercial and managerial skills and partly through their ability to get along with and keep the confidence of owners, workers and foremen.

Like artisans, members of category two are largely of local descent. Although they tend to be in the higher income brackets, they maintain kin and conjugal relationships among craftsmen and fishermen-farmers. The fact that their livelihood depends to a great extent on their standing within the system of locally based relations leads them to associate more closely with the local values. The circumstances of their commercial enterprises, however, also take them outside this local network. They must be able to act within the urban commercial ethic, and they must also maintain personal ties with their customers in the North

and elsewhere. The range of their social connections includes both local and supralocal ties, involving different and sometimes conflicting standards of behavior. The result is that while they maintain strong loyalty to general local values they tend to avoid close personal ties with their kin in the first category and confine their friendships to others who are in similar circumstances.

The third category is a composite one, consisting of individuals whose position depends on the productivity of others. It includes persons engaged in purely local services--private and administrative--of all kinds such as salesmen, clerks, repairmen, shopkeepers, professionals and those who are employed in repair shops and in transportation. The sociocultural background of these people varies. Those who perform manual labor tend to be of local descent and are culturally indistinguishable from members of the first category. The same is true for the lower echelons of employees in stores and in administrative offices. Shopowners, on the other hand, belong in part to families who have moved to Hemnesberget from other urban or semiurban centers in Northern Norway. Their kin and friendship relations tend to be dispersed among these communities, and this leads them to identify with the differentiated non-local middle class value system. Shopowners of local background also aspire to these standards, at the same time trying to maintain their position in the "local team" by showing loyalty to its values. Professionals are similarly drawn to Hemnes from the outside because of their technical expertise. The more stable core of this group, the school teachers, tend to be of North Norwegian background. Doctors, veterinarians, dentists and priests frequently come from the South. Invariably their values are those of the Pan-Norwegian elite.

Economic conditions in Hemnes leave little room for the academically trained and those with technical skills outside local niches. Consequently young people from all categories

who aspire to higher education must spend much of their student years away from Hemnes and will eventually have to seek employment somewhere else. While they remain students, however, they are partly dependent on their families. They tend to return home during the summer vacation and seek local employment.

Contextual Constraints.

Previous sections have dealt with the linguistic repertoire, internal cultural differences, and relevant features of social organization. We have suggested that linguistic alternates within the repertoire serve to symbolize the differing social identities which members may assume. It is, however, evident from our discussion that there is by no means a simple one-to-one relationship between specific speech varieties and specific social identities. Apart from the fact that values attached to language usage vary with social background, the same individual need not be absolutely consistent in all his actions. He may wish to appear as a member of the local team on some occasions, while identifying with middle class values on others. In order to determine the social significance of any one utterance, we need additional information about the

contextual clues by which natives arrive at correct interpretations of social meaning.

Recent linguistic writings have devoted considerable attention to speech events as the starting point for the analysis of verbal communication. It has been shown that aside from purely linguistic and stylistic rules, the form of a verbal message in any speech event is directly affected by a) the participants (i.e., speakers, addressees, and audiences); b) the ecological surroundings; and c) the topic or range of topics (Hymes 1964, Ervin-Tripp 1964).

In visualizing the relationship between social and linguistic factors in speech events, it seems reasonable to assume that the former restrict the selection of linguistic variables in somewhat the same way that linguistic contexts serve to narrow the broader dictionary meanings of words. For the purpose of our analysis, we can thus visualize verbal communication as a two-step process. In step 1, speakers take in clues from the outside and translate them into appropriate behavioral strategies. This step parallels the perceptual process by which referential meanings are converted into sentences. In step 2, these behavioral strategies are in turn translated into appropriate verbal symbols. The determinants of this communicative process are the speaker's knowledge of the linguistic repertoire, culture and social structure, and his ability to relate these kinds of knowledge to contextual constraints. For Hemnesberget, it seems useful to describe these constraints in terms of three concepts representing successively more complex levels of information processing.

We will use the term <u>setting</u> to indicate the way in which natives classify their ecological environment into distinct locales. This enables us to relate the opportunities for action

to constraints upon action provided by the socially significant features of the environment. First and most important among local settings in Hemnesberget is the home. Homes form the center for all domestic activities and act as meeting places for children's peer groups. Houses are well built and provide ample space for all. Also, friends and kin prefer the privacy of meetings at home to restaurants or other more public places.

Workshops and plants where productive activity is carried on are separated for the most part from residential areas, although some families continue to live next to their workshops along the shore of the fjord. The work force normally consists of male members of the group of owners, whether managed by a single nuclear family or by a group of families connected by filial, sibling or in-law ties. Employees in the larger plants frequently also include groups of kin who work together as work teams. In view of the homogeneity of workers, it is not surprising that the place of work frequently forms the center for informal gathering among males. In offices, shops and merchant establishments, on the other hand, where the expertise requirements favor socially more differentiated personnel, work relations tend to be less colored by pre-existent social ties.

A second group of settings lacks the specific restrictions on personnel which mark those mentioned above. These include the public dock, where visiting boats and the steamer are moored, as well as a few of the larger stores, for example the cooperative society store located near the central square, the square itself, and the community park. Here all local residents may meet somewhat more freely without commitments, subject of course to the constraints imposed by lack of privacy. The primary school, the junior high school, the church and community meeting hall all form somewhat more restricted meeting grounds

for more formal gatherings such as class room sessions, religious services, political meetings, meetings of various voluntary associations and occasional movie performances. The church is used only for church services.

The socio-ecological restrictions on personnel and activities still allow for a wide range of socially distinct happenings. The school, for example, is used for class sessions during the day and for meetings of voluntary associations during the evening. Similarly in the town square, men gather for discussions of public affairs, women shoppers stop to chat with acquaintances, adolescent peer groups play their various games, etc. A closer specification of social constraints is possible if we concentrate on activities carried on by particular constellations of personnel, gathered in particular settings during a particular span of time. We will use the term social situation to refer to these. Social situations form the background for the enactment of a limited range of social relationships within the framework of specific status sets, i.e., systems of complimentary distributions of rights and duties (Barth 1966).

Thus alternative social definitions of the situation may occur within the same setting, depending on the opportunities and constraints on interaction offered by a shift in personnel and/or object of the interaction. Such definitions always manifest themselves in what we would prefer to call a social event. Events center around one or at the most a limited range of topics and are distinguishable because of their sequential structure. They are marked by stereotyped and thus recognizable opening and closing routines. The distinction between situation and event can be clarified if we consider the behavior of Hemnes residents who are

sometimes seen in the community office, first transacting their business in an officially correct manner, and then turning to one of the clerks and asking him to step aside for a private chat. The norms which apply to the two kinds of interaction differ; the break between the two is clearly marked. Therefore they constitute two distinct social events although the personnel and the locale remain the same.

The terms setting, social situation, and social event as used here can be considered three successively more complex stages in the speaker's processing of contextual information. Each stage subsumes the previous one in such a way that the preceding one is part of the input affecting the selection rules of the next stage. Thus, a speaker cannot identify the social situation without first having made some decision as to the nature of the setting. To demonstrate how these factors influence language usage in Hemnesberget, we turn now to some examples drawn from participant observation.

The fact that the dialect reflects local values suggests that it symbolizes relationships based on shared identities with local culture. Casual observations and recording of free speech among locals in homes, workshops, and in the various public meeting places where such relationships are assumed, do indeed show that only the dialect is used there. On the other hand, statuses defined with respect to the superimposed National Norwegian system elicit the standard. Examples of these are church services, presentation of text material in school, reports and announcements--but not necessarily informal public appeals or political speeches--at public meetings. Similarly, meetings with tourists or other strangers elicit the standard at least until the participants' identity becomes more clearly known.

When within the same setting the participants' definition of the social event changes, a language shift may also occur. Thus when we who are known as outsiders stepped up to a group of locals engaged in conversation, our arrival caused an alteration in the casual posture of the group. Hands were removed from pockets, looks changed and predictably our inquiries were answered in the standard. Similarly, teachers report that they use the dialect in order to mark the transition from formal lectures in the standard, without interruption, to open discussion where the students are encouraged to speak freely. In each case there is a clear change in the actors' mutual rights and duties and in the definition of the situation. We will use the term role switching to refer to that kind of shift.

In contrast with those instances where language choice is narrowly constrained by social conditions, there are others in which participants are given considerably more latitude. Thus official community affairs are largely defined as non-local and hence the standard is appropriate. But since many individuals who carry out the relevant activities all know each other as fellow locals, they may feel free to interject casual statements in the dialect into their formal discussions. In the course of a morning spent at the community administration office, we noticed that clerks used both standard and dialect phrases, depending on whether they were talking about official affairs or not. Likewise when residents step up to a clerk's desk, greeting and inquiries about family affairs tend to be exchanged in the dialect, while the business part of the transaction is carried on in the standard. In neither of the above cases is there any significant change in the definitions of the situation. The language switch corresponds to change in topic rather than change in norms, and this means that its social meaning is different. . person who uses the standard in a situation where only the dialect is appropriate

alludes to an improper relationship. He risks serious disapproval, and his action may very well cause the conversation to be terminated or bring about other overt sanctions. On the other hand whenever two or more differently coded social relationships between the same set of individuals are relevant, the use of the dialect or standard to allude to these ties serves to enrich the content of the message. It validates the different facets of the speaker's social personality and thus his expertise. We'll use the term metaphorical switching for this phenomenon.

The case of the local who after finishing his business in the community office turns to a clerk and asks him to step aside for a private chat further illustrates the contrast between metaphorical and role switching. By their constant alternation between the standard and the dialect during their business transaction, they alluded to the dual relationship which exists between them. The event was terminated when the local asked the clerk in the dialect whether he had time to step aside to talk about personal affairs. The clerk looked around and said, "Yes, we are not too busy." The two then stepped aside although remaining in the same room, and their subsequent private discussion was carried on entirely in the dialect.

The Experiment.

Our discussion of verbal behavior so far has relied largely on deductive reasoning supported by unstructured ethnographic observation. Additional tests of our hypothesis are based on controlled text elicitation. Casual observations show that gatherings among friends and kin implying shared local identities must be carried on in the dialect. If we are correct in

our hypothesis, then individuals involved in such friendly gatherings should not change speech variety regardless of whether they talk about local, national, or official matters.

In order to test this, we asked local acquaintances whom we knew to be part of the network of local relationships to arrange a friendly gathering at which refreshments were to be served and to allow us to record the proceedings as samples of dialect speech. Two such gatherings were recorded, one in the living room of our local hosts, and the other in the home of an acquaintance. The fact that arrangements for the meeting were made by local people means that the groups were self-recruited. Participants in the first group included two sisters and a brother and their respective spouses. One of the men was a shopkeeper, one of the few in this category who claim local descent; his brothers-in-law were employed as craftsmen. All three men are quite literate compared to workmen elsewhere in the world and well read in public affairs. They are active in local politics and experienced in formal committee work. The second group included three craftsmen, friends and neighbors who worked in the same plant, and their wives. One of these had served as a sailor on a Norwegian merchant vessel for several years and spoke English. Participants were all quite familiar with standard Norwegian, and our recorded conversations contain several passages where the standard was used in quoting non-local speech or in statements directed at us.

Methodologically, self-recruitment of groups is important for two reasons. It insures that groups are defined by locally recognized relationships and enables the investigator to predict the norms relevant to their interaction. Furthermore, the fact that participants have pre-existing obligations towards each other means that, given the situation, they are likely to

respond to such obligations in spite of the presence of strangers. Our tape recording and our visual observations give clear evidence that this in fact was what occurred.

Our strategy was to introduce discussion likely to mobilize obligations internal to the group, thus engaging members in discussion among themselves. This proved to be relatively easy to do. When a point had been discussed for some time, we would attempt to change the subject by injecting new questions or comments. In doing this, we did not of course expect that our own interjections would predictably affect the speakers' choice of codes. Participants were always free to reinterpret our comments in any way they wished. Nevertheless, the greater the range of topics covered, the greater likelihood of language shift.

As a rule, our comments were followed by a few introductory exchanges directed at us. These were marked by relatively slow sentence speeds, many hesitation pauses, and visual clues indicating that people were addressing us. Linguistically, we noted some switching to the standard in such exchanges. After a brief period of this, if the topic was interesting, internal discussion began and arguments that referred to persons, places and events we could not possibly be expected to have any knowledge about developed. The transition to internal discussion was marked by an increase in sentence speed and lack of hesitation pauses and similar clues. The tape recorder was running continuously during the gatherings, and after some time participants became quite oblivious to its presence.

Only those passages which were clearly recognizable as internal discussion were used in the analysis; all others were eliminated. The texts obtained in this way consist of stretches of free discussion on diverse topics. The following

passages show that our hypothesis about the lack of connection between code switching and change in topic was confirmed.

Group I: Topic: Chit chat about local events.

Gunnar: ja de va ein så kåmm idag--ein så kåmm me mælka--så sa hanj dc va så varmt inj på mo i går--ja, sa eg, de va no iççe vent anjæ, dåkk må no ha meir enn di anjrann bestanjdi.

Yes there was one who came today--one who came with milk--
so he said it was so warm in Mo yesterday. Yes, I said, there is nothing else to be expected, you people must always have more than anybody else.

Topic: Industrial planning.

Alf: her kunj ha vøre eit par sånn mellomstore bedreftæ på ein førti-fæmti manj so ha beše̊ftigæ denna fålke så ha gådd ledi åmm vinjtærn.

There might have been here some medium-size plants employing forty to fifty men which then could offer work to those who have nothing to do in winter.

Topic: Governmental affairs.

Oskar: vi jekk inj før denn første injstiljingæ ifrå šeikommiteen.

We were in agreement with the first proposal made by the Schei Committee.

Item one deals with a local topic in a somewhat humorous way; items two and three concern planning and formal governmental

affairs. All these passages are clearly in the dialect. Of the phonological variables, [nj] and [lj] show the highest degree of palatalization and [a] and [æ] the highest degree of retraction throughout. Morphophonemic dialect marks are (R) ein, "one"; så, "who"; iççe, "not"; dåkk, "you"; meir, "more"; her, "here"; jekk, "went"; ifrå, "from." Even lexical borrowings from the standard such as injstiljing, "proposal" and bedreftæ, "plants" are clearly in dialect phonology and morphology. We find one single instance of what seems to be a standard form: (B) mellom/(R) imelja, "middle." But this only occurs as part of the borrowed compound mellomstore "medium-size." In several hours of conversation with both groups, marked by many changes in topic, we have not found a single clear instance of phonological or grammatical switching, in spite of the fact that all informants clearly know the standard well.

While our hypothesis suggests that switching is constrained in those situations which allow only local relationships to be enacted, it also leads us to predict that whenever local and non-local relationships are relevant to the same situation, topical variation may elicit code switching. To test this, we selected members of a formerly quite active local peer group. For the last few years these individuals have all been at universities in Oslo, Bergen, and Trondheim. They return home in the summer either for vacation or to take up local employment. In conventional interview sessions, all participants claimed to be pure dialect speakers and professed local attitudes about dialect use. They thus regard themselves as members of the local "team." As fellow students, however, they also share statuses that are identified with Pan-Norwegian values and associated with the standard. Our assumption then is that if

topical stimuli are introduced which elicit these values, switching may result.

Three gatherings were arranged in the home of one of our informants. Refreshments were again served. Elicitation strategies were similar to those employed with the first two groups and similar ranges of topics were covered. The examples cited below show that our hypothesis was again confirmed.

Group III Topic: Chit chat about drinking habits.

Berit: ja, ja mæn vi bjynjt anjer veien du--vi bjynjt i barnelošen--så vi har de unjajort.

Yes, yes, we started the other way, we started in the children's anti-alcoholic league. So we have finished all that.

Topic: Industrial development.

Berit: jo da viss di bare fikk de te lønn seg--så e i vært-fall prisnivåe hær i Rana skrudd høger enn de e vanligvis anner stann i lanne.

Yes, if they could only manage to make it profitable--so in any case the prices tend to be higher here in Rana than is common in other places in the country.

Topic: Informal statement about university regulations.

Ola: mænn no ha dæmm læmpæ på de.

But now they have relaxed that.

Topic: Authoritative statement about university regulations.

Ola: de væl du mellom en fæmm sæks.

You choose that from among five or six.

Comparison of Berit's and Ola's first statements with their second statements shows considerable shifting in each case. Thus Berit's second utterance has such unpalatalized forms as anner (versus anjer above), and raised and less retracted [a] in da. She also uses standard variables (B) fikk/(R) fekk, (B) viss/(R) vess, (B) værtfall/(R) kvart fall, (B) hær/(R) her, etc. Ola's second statement is characterized by (B) mellom/(R) imelja and (B) en/(R) ein. Similarly his [æ] in fæm and sæks is raised and fronted. In neither case is the shift to the standard complete--after all the situation never lost its informality. Berit's statement still contains dialect words like the (R) lønn/(B) lønne, "to be profitable"; (R) stan/(B) steder, "places"; and Ola has (R) væl/(B) velger, "to choose." What we see then is a breakdown of co-occurrence rules, an erosion of the linguistic boundary between Ranamål and Bokmål. The tendency is to switch towards standard phonology while preserving some morphophonemic and lexical dialect features. Features retained in this manner are largely those which also occur in other local dialects and to some extent also in Nynorsk. They have thus gained some acceptance as proper dialect forms. Those characteristics which locals refer to as broad speech, i.e., those that are known as purely local peculiarities, tend to be eliminated.

It must also be noted that Berit and Ola also differ in their pronunciation of the phonological variables. Ola's normal pronunciation shows the strong palatalization of consonants and extreme vowel retraction characteristic of most residents. Berit's normal pronunciation has medium palatalization and medium retraction. Both, however, switch in the same direction,

in response to similar situational and topical clues, and this agreement on the rules of stylistic manipulation is clearly more important in this case than the mere articulatory difference in Berit's and Ola's speech.

The social character of the style switch was clearly revealed when the tape recorded conversations were played back to other Hemnes residents. One person who had been working with us as a linguistic informant at first refused to believe that the conversations were recorded locally. When he recognized the voices of the participants, he showed clear signs of disapproval. Apparently he viewed the violation of co-occurrence rules as a sign of what is derogatorily called knot, "mixed speech" in colloquial Norwegian. Some of the participants showed similar reactions when they heard themselves on tape. They promised to refrain from switching during future discussion sessions. Our analysis of these later sessions, however, revealed that when an argument required that the speaker validate his status as an intellectual he would again tend to use standard forms in the manner shown above by Berit and Ola. Code selection rules thus seem to be akin to grammatical rules. Both operate below the level of consciousness and may be independent of the speaker's overt intentions.

Additional information about switching patterns in group three was provided through a fortunate accident. One of our sessions with this group was interrupted by a somewhat mentally retarded young person, who has the habit of appearing in peoples' homes to solicit assistance for his various schemes. Here are some examples of remarks addressed to him by Berit and Solveig, of all the members of the group most prone to use standard forms. Her normal pronunciation shows the least amount of consonant palatalization. She is socially more marginal to

Hennes than other members of the group.

Group III Topic: Talking to a retarded local youth.

Berit: e de du så vikarier førr hanj no

Are you a stand in for him now?

Solveig: hanj kanj jo jett gåte, hanj kanj no va me

He is good at work games, he should participate.

Both Berit and Solveig's pronunciation in the above examples become identical with the ordinary speech of Ola and of the members of group one. The extreme palatalization of [a] is not normal for them; they clearly are talking down in this case. Their stylistic range, as well as their facility in switching, seem to be greater than those of the others.

In comparing the behavior of the first two groups with that of group three, we find two different kinds of language usage patterns. The dialect as well as the standard occur in all groups. In group one and two, however, only role switching occurs. Bokmal phonology and grammar are used only when remarks are addressed directly to us who count as outsiders or in indirect quotes of such matters as government rules, on officials' statements, etc. Ranamål and Bokmål are kept separate by strict co-occurrence restrictions throughout. In group three, on the other hand, deviation from the dialect results both from metaphorical and role switching. In metaphorical switching co-occurrence rules break down.

The dialect usage of locals corresponds to their view that the two varieties are distinct, and to their insistence on maintaining the strict separation of local and non-local values. For the students, on the other hand, the distinction between dialect and standard is not so sharp. Although they display the same general attitudes about the dialect as the team of locals,

their behavior shows a range of variation rather than an alternation between distinct systems. It reflects a de facto recognition of their own non-local identification. Expressed attitudes towards the dialect and the standard thus do not provide an explanation for the differences in speech behavior. The most reasonable explanation of the ways these groups differ seems to be that the various social situations in which members find themselves operate to alter their interpretation of the social meaning of the linguistic variables they employ.

Conclusion.

Our analysis in this paper is based on the assumption that regularities in behavior can be analyzed as generated from a series of individual choices made under specifiable constraints and incentives (Barth 1966). This position implies an important break with previous approaches to social structure and to language and society. Behavioral regularities are no longer regarded as reflections of independently measurable social norms; on the contrary, these norms are themselves seen as communicative behavior. They are reflected in what Goffman (1959) calls the rules of impression management or, in our terms, in the social meanings which constrain the actor's adoption of behavioral strategies in particular situations.

In sociolinguistics, therefore, we can no longer base our analyses on the assumption that language and society constitute different kinds of reality, subject to correlational studies. Social and linguistic information is comparable only when studied within the same general analytical framework. Moving from statements of social constraints to grammatical rules thus represents a transformation from one level of abstraction to another within a single communicative system.

As Bernstein (1961) has pointed out, verbal communication is a process in which actors select from a limited range of alternates within a repertoire of speech forms determined by previous learning. Although ultimately this selection is a matter of individual choice, the rules of codification by which the deep structure of interpersonal relations is transformed into speech performances are independent of expressed attitudes and similar in nature to the grammatical rules operating on the level of intelligibility. They form part of what Hymes (1966) has called the speaker's communicative competence. Linguistic co-occurence rules seem to be of central importance in this codification process. We argued that they determine the speaker's perception of the utterances as a unit of social significance. By accepting the native's view of what is and what is not properly part of a dialect or language, linguists have tended to assume these co-occurrences rather than investigate them empirically. By combining various ethnographic field techniques with conventional linguistic elicitation methods, we have attempted to develop data collecting procedures suitable for the study of these rules.

In Hemnes, where Ranamål and Bokmål communicate the same objective information, we were led to ask how the apparent separateness of the dialect and the standard can exist and be maintained. Ethnographic investigation suggests the hypothesis that Ranamål has social value as a signal of distinctness and of a speaker's identification with others of local descent. This social significance of the dialect can only be understood by contrast with the meanings which locals assign to the standard, the language of non-local activities. The standard is associated with education and power on the national scene and carries connotations of differences in rank which are unacceptable in the realm of informal local relations. When used

casually among Hemnes residents, therefore, it communicates dissociation from the "local team."

Since most Hemnes natives live, marry, and earn their livelihood among others of their own kind, their values are rarely challenged. Their personal relations have all the characteristics of network closure (Barnes 1954). On the other hand, those with non-local bacckground and who maintain significant ties in other communities tend to seek their friends among those in similar circumstances, even though they may have resided in Hemnes for more than a generation. Their contacts with members of the "local team" remain largely non-personal, focusing around single tasks, and thus similar in kind to non-local contacts. This lack of personal ties betwen individuals of dissimilar backgrounds and cultural identification reinforces the general social meanings ascribed to the dialect by those who share local background and identity, and thus contributes to maintaining the separateness of dialect and standard.

While this information provides the background for our study, it does not explain the fact that all residents frequently switch between the dialect and the standard. This can only be explained through the analysis of particular speech events. The concepts of setting, social situation, and social event represent an attempt to explain the natives' conception of their behavioral environment in terms of a hierarchy of constraints which operate to transform alternative lines of behavior into particular social meanings. Our distinction between metaphoric and role switching shows how constraints on different levels of our hierarchy produce appropriate changes in the way speech performances are interpreted.

Although locals show an overt preference for the dialect, they tolerate and use the standard in situations where it

conveys meanings of officiality, expertise and politeness toward strangers which are clearly segregated from their personal life. In private gatherings where people meet as natives and equals, a speaker's use of standard variables suggests social dissociation which is clearly felt to be out of place. Although the students in our experimental sessions meet as locals and friends, they differ from other members of the local team because they share the additional status of intellectuals. This fact modifies the social meaning of standard forms when they are used among the students. To refrain from using standard forms for those topics which elicit participants' shared experience as intellectuals would constitute an unnatural limitation on their freedom of expression.

Our experiments, and the analysis presented in this paper, demonstrate the importance of social or non-referential meaning for the study of language in society. They suggest that in the absence of detailed information on the processes which generate such meanings, generalizations about the social implications of dialect differentiation are impossible. Since these processes are specific to particular small communities, we believe that considerably more investigation along these lines is necessary before broader predictions of language maintenance or language shift can be made. For Hemnesberget, the fate of the dialect seems assured as long as local identification maintains its importance, and the socio-ecological system continues to prevent any significant accumulation of individuals who, like the students, fail to maintain the situational barrier between the dialect and the standard.

Note

Some of the data cited in this study was reported in preliminary form in previous publications (Gumperz 1964 and 1964 in press). The authors are grateful to Aaron Cicourel and Richard Howell for their comments on an earlier draft of the present paper. Field work for the study was sponsored by the Institute of Sociology, University of Oslo. Mr Gumperz' stay in Norway was made possible through a grant from the National Science Foundation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barth, Fredrik (ed)
1963 The role of the entrepreneur in social change in northern Norway. Bergen, Norwegian Universities Press.

1966 Models of Social Organization. Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland. Occasional papers.

Barnes, John A.
1954 "Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish." Human Relations VII:39-58.

Bernstein, Basil
1961 "Social Structure, Language and Learning." Educational Research 3:163-176.

1964 "Elaborated and Restricted Codes: Their Social Origins and Some Consequences." American Anthropologist 66: no. 6, part 2: 55-69.

Christiansen, Hallfried
1962 Målet i Kana. Institutt for Sosiologi, Universitetet i Olso.

Coldevin, Axel
1958 Et bidrag til Rana-bygdens Sosialhistorie. Institutt for Sosiologi, Universitetet i Oslo.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan
1964 "An Analysis of the Interaction of Language, Topic, and Listener." American Anthropologist 66: no 6, part 2: 86-102.

Goffman, Erving
1959 The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Doubleday, Garden City, N. Y.

1964 "The Neglected Situation." American Anthropologist 66: no. 6, part 2: 133-137.

Gumperz, John J.
1964 On the Ethnology of Linguistic Change. UCLA Conference on Sociolinguistics. May 1964 (in press).

1964 "Linguistic and Social Interaction in Two Communities." American Anthropologist 66: no. 6, part 2: 137-153.

Hymes, Dell
1964 "Introduction." American Anthropologist 66: no. 6, part 2:

Labov, William
1964 "Phonological Correlates of Social Stratification." American Anthropologist 66: no. 6, part 2: 164-176.

Ramanujan,
1967 "The Structure of Variation: A Study of Caste Dialects." In Bernard Cohn & Milton Singer, Eds , Social Structure and Social Change in India Chicago